

## MINUTES

### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room  
John A. Hannah Building  
608 West Allegan  
Lansing, Michigan

October 9, 2007  
9:30 a.m.

Present: Mr. Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman  
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, President  
Mr. John C. Austin, Vice President  
Mrs. Carolyn L. Curtin, Secretary  
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire, Treasurer  
Mrs. Nancy Danhof, NASBE Delegate  
Mrs. Elizabeth W. Bauer  
Mr. Reginald M. Turner  
Ms. Casandra E. Ulbrich  
Mrs. Sue Carnell, representing Governor Jennifer M. Granholm,  
ex officio

Also Present: Mrs. June Teisan, 2007-2008 Michigan Teacher of the Year

### **REGULAR MEETING**

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Flanagan called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.

#### II. AGENDA FOLDER ITEMS

- A. REVISED page 11 of September 11, 2007 Meeting Minutes
- B. REVISED Approval of Revisions to the Michigan Department of Education Procedures for Determining Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores
- C. State Legislative Update

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. 2006-2007 Special Projects Grant for Michigan Model Tobacco Module Updates – Initial – added to agenda

- B. 2007-2008 Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology – Initial and Continuation – added to agenda
- C. 2007-2008 Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention for Neglected or Delinquent Children – Amendment – added to agenda
- D. 2007-2008 Title 1C, Education for Migratory Children, Regular Education – Initial – added to agenda
- E. 2006-2007 Comprehensive School Reform – Amendment – added to agenda
- F. 2007-2008 Training and Technical Assistance for William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs – Continuation – added to agenda
- G. 2007-2008 Mandated Activities Projects Interagency Contracts, Part B and C – Continuation – added to agenda
- H. 2007-2008 Michigan Charter School Grant Program – Initial – added to agenda
- I. 2005-2007 National Governor's Association (NGA) Subgrant – Amendment – added to agenda

**Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

IV. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS, DEPARTMENT STAFF, AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, State Board Executive, introduced members of the State Board of Education, Department of Education staff, and guests attending the meeting.

Mrs. Hamilton welcomed Mrs. June Teisan, 2007-2008 Michigan Teacher of the Year, to the Board table. She said Mrs. Teisan teaches seventh grade science at Harper Woods Secondary School.

V. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting at 9:40 a.m.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING**

### **VI. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Flanagan called the Committee of the Whole Meeting to order at 9:41 a.m.

### **VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **A. Presentation of Plan to Advance Teacher Preparation**

The following individuals presented:

- Sally Vaughn, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer
- MaryAlice Galloway, Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer
- Flora Jenkins, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services
- David Osta, Research Associate, Michigan State University

Mr. Flanagan said a study group consisting of a broad range of stakeholders met to provide recommendations regarding teacher preparation. He said he and Department staff spent considerable time reviewing the recommendations that resulted in "State Superintendent Mike Flanagan's Plan to Advance Teacher Preparation."

Mr. Flanagan said some of the recommendations are within the purview of the Board's responsibility and some are the State Superintendent's responsibility. Mr. Flanagan said for example, although it is within his authority to establish a Research Collaborative, he wants to verify that it make sense to the Board and listen to ideas for its formation.

Mr. Flanagan said although some of the recommendations may be considered bold, there is time for people to prepare. He said some of the recommendations will require immediate action to support the high school graduation requirements and address the needs of supply and demand of teachers in various subject areas.

Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Martin Ackley to present the Point of the Day.

## VIII. POINT OF THE DAY

Mr. Martin Ackley, Director, Office of Communications, presented the Point of the Day that focused on teacher shortages in the following five areas: mathematics, science, autism, learning disabilities, and special education resource rooms.

## IX. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

### A. Presentation of Plan to Advance Teacher Preparation (continued)

Discussion on this item resumed following the Point of the Day.

Mr. Flanagan said college and university deans need leverage to obtain resources, and prepare teachers to infuse technology in the classroom with an understanding of the way students in kindergarten through twelfth grade use technology.

Mr. Flanagan said the study group was directed to be mindful of moving from compliance to outcomes focused on student achievement. He said Michigan has a reputation for the best teacher preparation institutions in the country, but there is a need for demonstrating impact on student achievement.

A PowerPoint presentation was explained by Dr. Vaughn, Ms. Galloway, Dr. Jenkins, and Mr. Osta. The Plan includes:

- Ensuring Consistent High Quality Standards
- Meeting the Needs of Michigan Schools and Teacher Preparation Programs
- Meeting the Needs of Michigan Students
- Meeting the Needs of Teacher Candidates
- Meeting the Needs of Michigan Teachers

Mr. Flanagan asked the Board to share their immediate thoughts noting that he would take as long as needed for the Board to be comfortable. Board member comments and *staff clarifications* included:

1. this is a culmination of work on teacher quality and high quality educators begun by the Board Task Force on Ensuring Excellent Educators co-chaired by John Austin and Eileen Weiser; at that time the Board heard presentations by national experts citing the critical importance of teachers; teacher preparation and teacher professional development have to change so that student

achievement levels can rise and all students benefit from highly qualified teachers;

2. moving from compliance to outcomes and the Research Collaborative are good ideas; Research Collaborative should be implemented immediately;
3. need to hear more about the three-tiered licensure system;
4. reduction in the number of endorsements is good;
5. very pleased with the ambition and comprehensiveness of the Plan; teacher quality matters most in closing the achievement gap; rigor demands that we be ambitious and comprehensive in preparing and supporting teachers;
6. excited about ongoing tiered professional advancement, teacher induction and mentoring, and reformation of teacher preparation institutions;
7. questions will focus on specifics of the Research Collaborative; what data are needed; how advisory groups and others can function best;
8. pleased with ambition and scope; need time to be thoughtful over a period of time; need PowerPoint and background information to be made available to the Board – *Board will be given "Teacher Preparation Policy Study Group Recommendations and Research to State Superintendent of Public Instruction;"*
9. questions regarding moving from state to national accreditation of institutions; would it be accreditation by Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and/or National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); do they cover all the endorsement areas – *The Study Group document may not contain the level of detail requested by the Board, so additional information may be needed;*
10. mentoring and induction are good; mentoring is lifelong beyond levels 1 and 2; what does mentoring look like at all levels – *hopefully 3<sup>rd</sup> tiered teachers will become mentors;*
11. Michigan-specific priority – how does technology integrate with daily tasks in the classroom; how is the culture changed;

12. pleased with depth and breadth of the Plan;
13. pleased that the Plan is focused on the outcome of student achievement in the classroom; and helping classroom teachers become better facilitators of student achievement; thrilled with teaching through technology;
14. are universal education vision and principles included as a framework for policy development of this plan; how are we preparing teachers to teach culturally, linguistically, and ability diverse students; hoped for recommendations that would integrate at the university level the disciplines of special education and general education and graduate teachers who would know how to differentiate instruction so that all learners could achieve at high levels – *a piece of that will be in the standards that will be developed by the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers for Board approval; the plan is a framework for change over a period of years;*
15. today's presentation is a view of the forest first, before inspecting the bark on every tree – this a broad overview of the plan with details to follow;
16. think of this as a process to develop a plan – *some pieces are so apparent and so urgent that approval may be possible in November, and other pieces are more complex and will take more time;*
17. national accreditation of teacher preparation institutions is a major issue that needs to be discussed in detail;
18. expected something that would put the responsibility on colleges and universities for producing quality teachers; this seems to be for teachers in the field; disturbed about putting the onus for teacher performance based on classroom test results; actual standards need to be in place for judging performance – *it would not be based on raw test scores, but rather growth over time; performance assessment is not based on just one measure such as testing; other factors that have not yet been determined could be observation and interaction with parents;*
19. need more information regarding tiered-system and desired end result;

20. how are teachers selected to be the main mentor for a student teacher; who gets selected to be in mentoring programs and what is the basis;
21. how many Michigan teacher preparation institutions are currently NCATE or TEAC accredited – *13 out of 32 institutions, plus an additional 2 are in the process of TEAC accreditation;*
22. would the three-tiered teacher licensure be renewable or permanent – *renewable;*
23. are you considering aligning the Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation with the School Improvement Framework for continuous measures of outcome; continuous learning communities could help in mentoring – *the necessity of aligning various standards was part of the discussion;*
24. what would alternative routes to teacher certification look like – *the details need to be determined, however they would not be “last resorts” but rather a rigorous and meaningful route for a different type of candidate such as people changing careers who are not undergraduates; we want to learn about the best programs and increase the capacity;*
25. how would education students currently going through the process of becoming certified be impacted as this plan is being “rolled out” – *a projected date would be determined, and teachers that received certification prior to the specified date would receive the information through professional development;*
26. prospective teachers should receive information regarding the job market and employment opportunities in the state;
27. make sure that people with content expertise who join the teaching career mid-stream have instruction in pedagogy;
28. it is important that the third tier teacher licensure is voluntary, and there is no stigma in remaining at the second tier; there may be many great teachers who choose not to seek the third tier because it is not a fit for them – *third tier is voluntary;*

29. it is important for teachers to be trained in technology programs so they can connect with today's students using the tools students use;
30. why is a new set of standards being used for the third level rather than using national certification – *details aren't worked out; it could be an advanced level like national board certification;*
31. need to determine the sequence of topics the Board should discuss in order to continue to move forward;
32. other states are ahead of Michigan in putting into place teacher performance assessments that combine several techniques; critical for this process is how to develop continuing teacher performance assessments focused on student outcomes and that they be developed with the input of teachers and teacher unions – *under the No Child Left Behind Act teachers are being penalized at a certain stage by possibly losing jobs, or school closings based on test scores alone; trying to synchronize the system so that teacher education institutions can partner on accountability; trying to use data to show growth and teachers can take pride in student progress; and*
33. make sure teachers are truly getting the help they need to achieve growth in student progress through effective mentoring and student teaching.

Mr. Flanagan said the entire Plan is being presented to the Board for review so they are comfortable with the Plan, although more than one-half of the Plan is the authority of the State Superintendent. He said the discussion and approval process can take as long as needed. Mr. Flanagan said the Plan is multi-year involving many other approvals with details to be worked out.

34. the job of the State Board of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction collectively is to shape education policy;
35. the Plan is about teacher quality overall including career advancement and teacher satisfaction which are very important;
36. what does research show regarding best practice in teacher preparation, specifically in teacher internship versus traditional student teaching; need common understanding on best practice of how teachers practice their craft before they teach by themselves in a classroom – *this would be something a*



*Research Collaborative could do; parts of the Plan could change over time if research indicates that need;*

- 37. it would be good to establish a Research Collaborative;
- 38. national accreditation is a major change that requires more discussion;
- 39. three-tiered teacher licensure system and its implications; role of mentoring and induction process for teachers is critical;
- 40. the Michigan-specific priority of technology is included in the Board's "Embracing the Information Age" Task Force Report as the Seventh Standard for teacher preparation;
- 41. emphasize the need to train teachers to be able to teach all students Algebra I and Algebra II, not just college-bound students; train general education teachers to teach special education students who are mainstreamed; and
- 42. need to recognize teachers and reward them for remaining in the classroom; administrative positions should not be the only opportunities for teachers to advance.

Mr. Flanagan said there are three initiatives that he would like Board consensus on: (1) national accreditation, (2) Michigan-specific priority, and (3) three-tiered licensure system. He said additional information on these initiatives will be provided at future meetings.

- 43. eager to support most all of the major topics in concept. He there is a strong case for national accreditation. He said the Board needs to hear more about why the recommendation to offer both NCATE and TEAC accreditation makes sense;
- 44. supports the Research Collaborative concept in order to obtain the information the Board and Department need and at the same time take advantage of the incredible horse power of Michigan universities that are world leaders in education;

State Board members expressed concern that only the two-page Plan was provided, and they would like more background information.

45. there is a professor at Eastern Michigan University who has a grant to improve the teaching skills of elementary science teachers to determine the impact on student achievement;
46. would like additional discussion regarding alternative ways of measuring teacher performance;

Mr. Flanagan thanked the members of the study group, and those present introduced themselves.

State Superintendent Mike Flanagan's Plan to Advance Teacher Preparation is attached as Exhibit A.

Mrs. Curtin left the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

X. RECESS

The Board recessed the Committee of the Whole Meeting at 12:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:10 p.m.

XI. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

- B. Presentation on Draft K-8 Physical Education Grade Level Content Expectations
- C. Presentation on Draft Revised Michigan Merit Curriculum Credit Guidelines for Physical Education

The above mentioned items were presented together by the following individuals:

- Mary Ann Chartrand, Director, Office of Grants Coordination and School Support
- Trina Boyle-Holmes, Physical Education Consultant, Office of Grants Coordination and School Support

Over the past year a committee representing physical education communities met to establish grade level content expectations and Michigan Merit Curriculum Credit Guidelines. The expectations are aligned directly with the Michigan and the National Standards for Physical Education. Following State Board review and input, a public review of these documents is scheduled to occur during the month of October.

Board member comments and *staff clarifications* included:

1. what are the certified physical education teacher endorsements of MB, MX, and SP – *MB is physical education; MX is health, physical education and recreation; and SP is physical education for students with disabilities;*
2. “demonstrate incomplete and inconsistent elements of selected movement concepts” wording should be changed to “an age appropriate level of ability for a beginning learner” or another positive phrase;
3. in phrases such as “students will exhibit, occasionally, behaviors. . .” change sentence structure for ease of reading;
4. some schools don’t have regular access to a pool or body of water for aquatics instruction – *a disclaimer will be added stating that it is understood that not all schools have facilities to provide aquatics instruction;*
5. are the content expectations compatible with Exemplary Physical Education Curriculum (EPEC) – *did not want the grade level content expectations written to a specific curriculum although several committee members were also members of the consortium that created the EPEC document;*
6. has the Governor’s Council on Physical Fitness, Health & Sports commented on the document – *they will have that opportunity as soon as it is available for public review;*
7. is there a physical education requirement in Michigan – *no it is not required by law; physical education must be offered, but students can opt out and local districts decide frequency, time, and duration; State Board of Education policy encourages it;*
8. are instructional periods totaling 150 minutes per week (elementary) and 225 minutes per week (middle and high schools) recommendations – *yes;*
9. page 2 of each grade level, lead in paragraph listing three critical areas - “opportunity to learn” is missing;
10. do all kindergarten through grade 8 grade level content expectations have a compatible format – *yes;*
11. how long will public review of the document last – *6 weeks.*

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned the Committee of the Whole at 1:34 p.m. to reconvene the Regular Meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING**

XIII. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES

- A. Approval of Minutes of Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of September 11, 2007

**Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mr. Austin, that the State Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of September 11, 2007, as modified.**

A revised Page 11 is included in the Agenda Folder.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Ulbrich  
Absent: Curtin**

**The motion carried.**

XIV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

- A. Ms. Shug Brandell, Battle Creek, Michigan. Ms. Brandell, representing the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, provided verbal and written comments on a federal grant for small learning communities that they received in conjunction with six Michigan high schools. Ms. Jim Bodrie, Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, joined her at the table.
- B. Mrs. Mary T. Wood, Warren, Michigan. Mrs. Wood presented verbal comments on public school academies and management companies.

XV. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – MR. MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN

Mr. Flanagan said although the Board does not usually respond during the Public Participation portion of the meeting, he would like to respond to comments made by Mrs. Mary T. Wood.

Mr. Flanagan said his authority is limited to one area regarding public school academies, which is revoking the authorizer's right to authorize public school academies if they do not perform properly. He said he met with the authorizer and he believes they responded appropriately in this instance, which was an investigation by the authorizer resulting in a new board for the public school academy and termination of its management company. He said it is not within his authority to directly investigate management companies. He said each authorizer is governed by its own board which has the authority in that area.

Mr. Flanagan said standards are very vague for measuring the appropriateness of terminating an authorizer's authority with regard to the chartering of public school academies. Mr. Turner said the State Board of Education or Superintendent of Public Instruction may want to develop standards or suggest legislation regarding management companies and their relationship to public school academies and accountability of public funding.

XVI. APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE SCORES

Dr. Flora Jenkins, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services, presented Approval of Revisions to the Michigan Department of Education Procedures for Identifying Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores.

Revisions to this item are included in the Agenda Folder.

Dr. Jenkins said the Office of Professional Preparation Services identified teacher preparation performance scores in compliance with Title II of the Higher Education Act. She said the Board approved the "Teacher Preparation Performance Score" criteria and scoring rubric at its June 13, 2006, meeting, and changes to the procedures for 2007-08 are being submitted for Board approval. She said additional revisions may be suggested in the future as a result of the Plan to Advance Teacher Preparation.

After discussion, Dr. Jenkins said the statement that appears several times in Attachment A will be revised as follows: (decimals will be rounded to the nearest ~~tenth~~ WHOLE NUMBER).

Mrs. Straus said there should be more points given for diversity and preparation of teachers in high need subject areas. Mr. Flanagan said it is intended that this would be one of the topics examined by the Research Collaborative.

**Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mr. Austin, that the State Board of Education approve the revised Michigan Department of Education procedures for determining teacher preparation institution performance scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 24, 2007, and as modified by discussion.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Ulbrich**  
**Absent: Curtin**

**The motion carried.**

Mr. Turner left the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

**XVII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

**A. Welcome Mrs. Teisan to Board Table**

Mrs. Straus welcomed Mrs. June Teisan, 2007-2008 Michigan Teacher of the Year, to the Board table. She said due to budget limitations, Mrs. Teisan will spend the year teaching in her classroom, and will join Board meetings and other engagements when possible.

**B. Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations Roll Out**

Mrs. Straus said she, Mrs. Bauer, Mrs. Curtin, Mrs. Danhof, and Mrs. McGuire, attended the Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations Roll Out at Michigan State University on October 4, 2007, where Mr. Flanagan was a speaker. She said there were over 800 people, including teachers and curriculum directors, who participated in engaging discussions and offered good suggestions that will help inform the companion document. She said the overall reaction was very positive.

Mrs. Straus commended Board members for modeling bipartisanship during the approval process of the Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations through creativity and their ability to reach consensus. She said the Board and Department staff listened to people's critiques and suggestions, and crafted workable compromises and solutions.

## XVIII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

### Reports

- E. Human Resources Report
- F. Report on Department of Education Cosponsorship
- G. Report on Property Transfer and Teacher Revocation Decisions
- H. Report on St. Joseph County Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- I. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers

### Grants

- J. 2005-2006 Title II, Part A, Teacher Quality Statewide Activities – Amendment
- K. 2007-2008 Michigan Charter School Grant Program – Initial
- L. 2007-2008 Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs – Amendment
- M. 2007-2008 Rural and Low Income School Program – Initial
- N. 2007-2008 Reading First – Continuation
- O. 2006-2007 Title 1C, Summer Migrant – Amendment
- P. 2006-2007 Title III, English Language Acquisition Program – Amendment
- Q. 2007-2008 IDEA, Part B Mandated Activities Projects – Initial
- R. 2007-2008 Special Projects Grant for Suicide Prevention – Initial
- S. 2007-2008 Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology, Category III, Comprehensive K-12 Data Management and Student Tracking System – Continuation
- Y. 2006-2007 Special Projects Grant for Michigan Model Tobacco Module Updates – Initial
- Z. 2007-2008 Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology – Initial and Continuation

- AA. 2007-2008 Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention for Neglected or Delinquent Children – Amendment
- BB. 2007-2008 Title IC, Education for Migratory Children, Regular Education – Initial
- CC. 2006-2007 Comprehensive School Reform – Amendment
- DD. 2007-2008 Training and Technical Assistance for William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs – Continuation
- EE. 2007-2008 Mandated Activities Projects Interagency Contracts, Part B and C – Continuation
- FF. 2007-2008 Michigan Charter School Grant Program – Initial
- GG. 2005-2007 National Governor’s Association (NGA) Subgrant – Amendment

Mr. Flanagan said considerable time and effort was spent preparing for a possible shut down of state government as October 1<sup>st</sup> approached without a budget in place. He said he is proud of staff members who continue to work conscientiously under strained circumstances due to the state’s fiscal crisis.

Mrs. McGuire said she had a question regarding 2007-2008 Michigan Charter School Grant Program – Initial (Item K) and 2007-2008 Michigan Charter School Grant Program – Initial (Item FF), and whether a portion of the grant funds could be used for oversight by the Department. Ms. Joann Neuroth, Supervisor, Public School Academy Unit, Office of School Improvement, said an outside evaluation is done as a condition of the federal grant; and the Department also does desk monitoring and on-site visits of the grant recipients. She said these are grants for new public school academies allowing for one year to plan and two years to implement. In response to Mrs. McGuire, Ms. Neuroth said last year’s evaluation report will be shared with the Board.

Mr. Flanagan said it would be a great opportunity for a public school academy lead by creative teachers, and authorizers are looking for innovative, visionary practitioners to sponsor. Mr. Flanagan and Ms. Neuroth said they have had conversations with representatives of the Michigan Education Association and Michigan Federation of Teachers regarding this opportunity. Ms. Neuroth offered to contact any possible prospects Board members may know.



Mrs. Straus asked for clarification on Report on the St. Joseph County Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services (Item H). Dr. Thompson said the level system of services supports children based on their level of need not on their eligibility category. She said the question then becomes, "To what extent do we need to support this student to achieve in the general education curriculum?" She said staff members at the intermediate school district have collected data over the years indicating that this is a successful model that is changing the way people view special education.

Mrs. Straus asked why the Detroit grant was reduced by \$42,850 as part of the 2006-2007 Comprehensive School Reform Grant (Item CC). Mrs. Underwood said there were three school districts that had a reduction, due to funds remaining from the previous year.

#### XIX. TEACHER OF THE YEAR REPORT

Mrs. June Teisan, 2007-2008 Michigan Teacher of the Year, presented Teacher of the Year Report.

Mrs. Teisan said she is thankful for the warm welcome she received. She said the Board should be commended for including the Teacher of the Year at the Board table. She said it sends a positive message to the state as well as the nation, since Michigan is one of a very few states where the Teacher of the Year is included in deliberations of the Board.

Mrs. Teisan said she has moved into the new Harper Woods Middle School/High School Complex. She said she and her colleagues are seeing increasing numbers of students coming to school with challenges that require additional supports at school.

Mrs. Teisan said she attended a summer space and rocket camp on a grant from General Motors and Lockheed Martin through the Detroit Science Center. She said she and her fellow teachers successfully applied for a grant for mathematics in the middle school from the DTE Energy Foundation. She said the two-year grant is for \$22,000 for rocket mathematics for seventh grade students. She said they are collaborating with people who work in the areas of science, mathematics, engineering and technology to show students the relationship between these areas. She said there is time for planning and evaluation; and students will construct rockets to be launched in May. She said DTE Energy is interested in searching for best practices and duplicating them.

XX. STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Ms. Lisa Hansknecht, Legislative Director, presented State Legislative Update. She said the State Legislative Update is included in the Agenda Folder.

Ms. Hansknecht said after a five-hour shutdown on October 1, 2007, the Legislature passed bills containing cuts, reforms, and a 30-day continuation budget that were signed by the Governor and enacted into law.

Ms. Hansknecht said the Department is facing a two and one-half percent cut in state general funds. She said House Bill 4591, Teacher Certification Database Rewrite, will be discussed by the Senate Appropriations Committee on October 10, 2007. She said this bill provides the funding to rewrite the old database, which is close to crashing. She said this is a fee increase which has not been raised since 1988, and with appropriate funding, this part of the Department will be self-sufficient, and will provide funding for maintenance and future updating of the database.

Ms. Hansknecht said House Bill 4592 was enacted. She said this law requires intermediate school districts (ISDs) to study services that could be shared or consolidated between their constituent districts, other ISDs, other governmental entities, and itself. She said the ISDs will report to the Department, and information will be summarized and reported to the Legislature.

Ms. Hansknecht said Senate Bill 549 was enacted, providing for a common school calendar at the intermediate school district level not later than July 1, 2008.

Mrs. Straus asked for an update on Senate Bills 804 through 814 regarding test related legislation, including the elimination of social studies testing. Ms. Hansknecht said the bills are pending. Mr. Flanagan said the intent is to save funding, and it won't; just as the move to ACT testing did not save money.

Mr. Austin said the MEAP test is aligned to the most rigorous standards in the country, as stated by Achieve, Incorporated; and the Michigan Chamber of Commerce. He said the Michigan Business Leaders for Education Excellence should be our allies with regard to this issue.

Mrs. Bauer said there needs to be an organized plan for contacting the sponsors of the bills. Mr. Flanagan said Ms. Hansknecht will work on this.

No action was required.

XXI. UPDATE ON FEDERAL ISSUES

Ms. Roberta Stanley, Director, Administrative Law and Federal Relations, presented Update on Federal Issues.

Ms. Stanley said the federal reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act is done every five years. Mr. Flanagan said Michigan submitted comments under the leadership of Ms. Stanley.

Ms. Stanley reviewed issues related to the No Child Left Behind Act, federal budget appropriations, and The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP).

Ms. Stanley said she will give the Board members a copy of an op-ed "Get Congress Out of the Classroom" by Diane Ravitch, professor of education at New York University that appeared in the *New York Times* on October 3, 2007.

No action was required.

XXII. CONSENT AGENDA

Criteria

- W. Approval of Criteria for the USDOE Integration of Schools and Mental Health Systems Grant

Resolution

- X. Adoption of Resolution Regarding Local School Board Member Recognition Month

**Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mr. Austin that the State Board of Education approve the Superintendent's recommendations for the consent agenda, as follows:**

- W. approve the Grant Criteria for the USDOE Integration of Schools and Mental Health Systems Grant, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 24, 2007; and**
- X. adopt the resolution regarding Local School Board Member Recognition Month, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated September 24, 2007.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Ulbrich**  
**Absent: Curtin, Turner**

**The motion carried.**

The resolution regarding Local School Board Member Recognition Month is attached as Exhibit B.

**XXIII. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS**

**A. Michigan Council of Teachers of English – Mrs. Elizabeth Bauer**

Mrs. Bauer said she spoke to the Michigan Council of Teachers of English on October 5, 2007. She said it was a wonderful experience.

She distributed a copy of handout she received regarding English Language Arts Grade Level Content Expectations. She said there is concern that in some districts the language arts standards are being put into practice in rigid and restrictive ways, narrowing, rather than supporting, the freedom of local teachers to make decisions about curriculum and instruction. She said the intent of the Board was to grant credit for competencies rather than seat time. She said organizations should be encouraged to include implementation of grade level content expectations on their conference agendas and publications for further clarification.

**XXIV. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Flanagan said Board members are encouraged to submit agenda topics to the Executive Committee comprised of Mrs. Straus, Mr. Austin, and Mrs. Curtin.

**XXV. FUTURE MEETING DATES**

- A. November 13, 2007
- B. December 11, 2007
- C. January 8, 2008
- D. February 12, 2008

**XXVI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn L. Curtin  
Secretary